

The Converted Catholic

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

For the instruction of Protestants regarding Romanism and for the enlightenment and conversion of Roman Catholics to the Evangelical Faith.

Published by

CHRIST'S MISSION
EVANGELICAL—NON-SECTARIAN.

Founded by the late, the Rev. James A. O'Connor, 1883.

BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D.D., Director and Editor.

Trustees.

Bishop R. L. Rudolph, M.A., D.D.
Bishop Manuel Ferrando, D.D.

The Rev. D. J. Burrell, D.D., LL.D.
Madison J. H. Ferris, Minister.

331 West 57th Street.

NEW YORK.

VOL. XXXII.

OCTOBER, 1915.

No. 10.

CONTENTS

	Page
Dying Testimony of James Nayler, 1660.....	306
Editorial Notes	307
" " The Inquisition	308
" " Does the Inquisition Actually Exist?.....	309
" " Christ's Mission Services.....	311
Rome's Bid for Temporal Power. By Ernest Phillipps.....	313
Letter to Cardinal Gibbons, XLIII. By Bishop Manuel Ferrando, D.D.....	321
Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop of Caracas and Venezuela, S. A.....	327
Away from Rome. By Knockma.....	335

SUBSCRIPTION RATES, POSTPAID.

All subscriptions are payable annually in advance.

Subscription per year.....	\$1.50	To Ministers and Missionaries....	\$1.00
Single copy	15	Twenty or more copies, each....	10
Ten copies to one address, per year, each	1.25	Agents, 20 or more copies per year, each	1.00

Subscription per year in English money, Six shillings threepence.

Remittances should be made by Check, P. O. Money Order, Express Order or Draft on New York, made payable to Christ's Mission or to The Converted Catholic, 331 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York. Cash should be sent by Registered Mail. United States postage stamps received in small quantities and small denominations. Do not send stamps above ten cents each. Do not send Canadian or other foreign stamps or money.

Expiration. The date on the address label, on the wrapper, indicates the month and year of the expiration of the subscription. It is a bill when the subscription price is past due, and a receipt after payment is made and the date is changed. No other acknowledgment will be made of payments in renewal. Acknowledgment by letter is unnecessary, and is expensive, laborious and wasteful of much valuable time.

Change of Address. In making changes, send both old and new address.

Correspondence. Address all correspondence to the Director of Christ's Mission, 331 West 57th Street, New York City.

Entered at the Post Office, New York, as second-class matter.

DYING TESTIMONY

of

JAMES NAYLER, 1660

There is a Spirit, which I feel, that delights to do no evil, nor to revenge any wrong; but delights to endure all things, in hope to enjoy its own in the end. Its hope is to outlive all wrath and contention, and to weary out all exaltation and cruelty, or whatever is of a nature contrary to itself. It sees to the end of all temptations. As it bears no evil in itself, so it conceives none in thoughts to any other. If it be betrayed it bears it, for its ground and spring is the mercies and forgiveness of God. Its crown is meekness; its life is everlasting love unfeigned; it takes its kingdom with entreaty and not with contention, and keeps it by lowliness of mind. In God alone it can rejoice, though none else regard it, or can own its life. It is conceived in sorrow, and brought forth without any to pity it; nor doth it murmur at grief and oppression. It never rejoiceth but through sufferings—for with the world's joy it is murdered. I found it alone, being forsaken. I have fellowship therein with them who lived in dens and desolate places in the earth, who through death obtained this resurrection and eternal holy life.

The Converted Catholic

"When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."—Luke 22: 32.

Vol. XXXII

OCTOBER, 1915

No. 10

EDITORIAL NOTES

"Zeal not according to knowledge."—Romans 10: 2.

There is a great deal of energy spent in the world which proves to be useless, and, from a Scriptural standpoint, a failure. There is a great deal of planning of new devices in order to *help God* to improve the world. Worldly methods are employed, a gift for organizing or a capacity for applying business methods to religion are looked upon as veritable inspirations; and all the while the spirit of evil is trampling down all these plans for human betterment and gaining ground each day.

The Apostle Paul has hit the mark and discerned the true reason for this. We may have zeal, but without knowledge, this zeal is vain. It is human all through, without the Divine wisdom to guide it, and therefore, however vehement, it is futile.

It is hard to acknowledge our own failures, and very easy to try to go beyond our powers instead of acknowledging our limitations. When we look at the way marked out by our Lord, it is easy to see that the cause of our failing is only that we have turned aside from it, every man to his own way.

God is a Spirit, and all who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth. And if our desires, efforts and energies are sincerely aiming toward a spiritual end, we can easily find out when our worship lacks in genuine spirituality, for that is based upon the truth.

Truth, we are told, will stand forever, while the methods and devices and opinions of men are ever changing. We are also told that the word of God is truth. "Thy word is truth." And it is the Spirit alone through this word that can "transform our

minds in the knowledge of God." It is the Spirit alone "that quickeneth."

The actual condition of the world proves this to be true. In every Christian denomination new activities are being multiplied day by day, and yet hundreds of people are turning to the Eastern philosophies, New Thought and other systems, which proves that the inmost soul of man is striving after spiritual food and that we have been starving hungry souls on patented foods which have no substance because they do not come from God, who alone can nourish the soul. How much better for the world and for every individual it would be, if we were to realize the truth of the words attributed to St. Augustine, "O God, Thou hast made my soul for Thyself, and it will wander restlessly to and fro until it find repose in Thee!"

We may detain the human soul for awhile and blind it with the glitter and pomp of ceremony and ritual, among the lights of candles, the mist of incense and the splendor of priestly vestures. We may attract youth for awhile with entertainments and pastimes, with the deceptive thought that under cover of that sugar-coating we can instil religion like a medicine. But we shall soon find to our disappointment that many will go after more soul-satisfying things and perhaps be led astray; while in many others we have smothered the feeble spiritual flame and deprived them of the faculty of discerning between the world and religion.

Our text suggests the solution of all these conflicting problems. We have to *know* God better in order to understand what things will please Him.

The Inquisition

The leaders of the Roman Catholic Church in this country have tried to shift the responsibility of the Inquisition and its horrors, as practised in Spain and every other land where it was implanted, upon those countries. Of course, they succeeded in deceiving the ignorant by creating an impression that Rome no longer taught the doctrines upon which the Inquisition was founded. If we could take some of the over-credulous ones to our convents, even for a few hours, they would be convinced that the horrors of the Inquisition cannot be measured by the rela-

tively few recorded *Autos da Fé*, but by the untold tortures practised in the convents and which have never become known to the world outside their walls.

We are glad to notice that the Church, in spite of her boasted unity and perfect control over all her officers, cannot always prevent some *imprudent old monk* or *belligerent priest* from contradicting her statements for the sake of showing his own knowledge. This happens everywhere and the United States is no exception. Here, it has been Father Phelan, of the "Western Watchman," who took it upon himself to boldly contradict popes, bishops and priests, and all those who tried to show that they knew more than he did. So, just when the Jesuits of this country were gaining ground among many Protestants by their misrepresentations on the subject of the Inquisition, Father Phelan came out with one of his abrupt statements, which, like a catapult, brought their fabric of lies crashing about their ears. "Protestants," he declared, "were persecuted in France and Spain with the full approval of the Church authorities. The Church has persecuted. Only a tyro in Church history will deny that. We have always defended the persecution of the Huguenots and the Spanish Inquisition. When she thinks it good to use force, she will use it. But will the Catholic Church give bond that she will not persecute at all? Will she guarantee absolute freedom and equality of all Churches and faiths? The Catholic Church gives no bond for her good behavior."

Does The Inquisition Actually Exist?

The Church has never abolished the Inquisition. Wherever it existed, it has been suppressed by the civil powers, the Church reluctantly acceding; but, in order to preserve the right to exercise it in the future, the Church has still in Rome the Congregation of the Inquisition, with the added title of "Universal." Should temporal power be restored to the Church, this congregation would reinstate its tribunals, as they were before. Another reason for this is that the Church has not condemned the laws which justified the Inquisition. These laws exist and are as much in force as they were in the Middle Ages, and their spirit is infiltrated among the youth in seminaries, and even more so

in the convents. There are hundreds of monks to-day who truly believe that it is giving more glory to God to kill a heretic who has refused the means of salvation offered by the Church, than to allow him to live and corrupt others.

The Inquisition adopted different degrees of severity in its dealings with heretics; first there was persuasion and intimidation, then torture, and finally, in case of obduracy, death. The power vested in the Inquisitors was so basely abused, that, in spite of all that has been published, the world can form no correct estimate of the number and enormity of the crimes for which they were responsible. Thousands of cases are known to us of persons who died as heretics, whose only crime was the refusal to accede to the immoral propositions of the officers of the Inquisition. How do I know this? I found in a convent in Seville a manuscript—which Cardinal Vives, when I showed it to him, at once confiscated—containing the most horrible accusations against the Dominicans of Seville (Inquisitors). The whole manuscript, a large folio volume, was composed of practical cases. I remember once mentioning it to the Provincial of the Dominicans. "Oh, never mind those things," he answered; "we have in our convents worse things written against you, the Capuchins! The best thing would be to make a fraternal *auto da fé* between us and condemn all these accusations to the flames." It was too late to consign mine to the proposed bonfire, as Cardinal Vives had taken it to Rome.

In the subterranean prison for the monks, in the convent of Seville, there was on the door a copy of a bull of the pope forbidding, on pain of excommunication, all communication with heretics; and on the walls of the corridors were several inscriptions, like these: "Let the unhappy excommunicated have no one to help or succor him, nor find any who shall have mercy upon his children." "Let them be abhorred of all men, and rebuked in their evil works." "When he cries out with thirst, let there be none found to give him water; and when he is hungry, let no man give him bread." "Let all the plagues of Egypt come upon him, and the curse of Sodom and Gomorrha, and let him burn in hell, as they burned."

It is clear that here the tribunal did not kill any one. The superior simply commanded the excommunicated monk to be im-

prisoned in the dungeon, and as no one could speak to him, or give him a piece of bread or a cup of water, after a few days of this solitude and starvation he found it better to die than to live. No one killed him, oh, no! He was imprisoned for just cause, and he died in prison, that was all.

From the above our readers will understand that even if the Church tries to shift her responsibility in many cases of mobs and public persecutions, as not being authorized by her, nevertheless she is responsible, because the actors in these riots were simply carrying out the principles they learned from the Church and which she has not yet denied.

In this issue we publish a pastoral letter of the Archbishop of Caracas. An ex-priest answered it and was thrown into prison therefor. His answer, the story of his persecutions and the sufferings to which he was submitted, will follow in the next number. I think this will be the most convincing proof that the inquisitorial spirit is as much alive in the Church to-day as it has ever been.

Christ's Mission Services

We are glad to report to our friends that the Sunday afternoon services at Christ's Mission are proving to be more interesting than they have ever been before, and we have seen more Catholics at our services than in previous years. We have begun a series of lectures on idolatry, and as far as we have progressed in our discussion of the subject, there has been no dissenting voice. The reason for this, we believe, is that we do not feel we are called to fight—we are called to give the people, as far as we are able, the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. As in our writings, we give only the clear exposition of the doctrines of the Church, putting them side by side with the Gospel, and then let every one draw his own conclusions. And we are not afraid to say what we do, even if the pope himself were present. Were it possible that he should be present and contradict any one of our statements, we should heartily congratulate him on the progress he has made in rejecting the former dogmas of the Church.

Not only have we received the felicitations of Catholics who have been here, but many have requested, and we have been

glad to grant, private interviews, which we trust will do even more good to these inquiring souls than the public address, even though they are still within the pale of the Church.

We should like to see more of the Protestants at our services, especially more of the ministers. We have always much to say, not only to the Catholics, but to Protestants also. Some Protestants have the idea that we cannot hold a service without its being broken up by a fight, and they are agreeably surprised to see that there is no Church that can boast of more quiet, orderly and reverent worship than we enjoy at Christ's Mission. I have never seen a better proof that only the truth makes us free and one in Christ than the services of Christ's Mission. There are gathered people of different creeds, listening to opposing doctrines, and yet going out with one mind and one conviction, which is, that the hope of the world lies neither in Protestantism nor in Catholicism, but in the Christianity of Jesus.

Rome Demands Religious Liberty

We hope that many of our readers have noticed to their edification how the Roman Church is making a great outcry, demanding religious liberty in Mexico, whereas, for many years past she has been fighting against it and allowing her priests to rouse the populace in mobs and persecutions against our missionaries and colporteurs.

Our readers should remember that her cry for religious liberty does not mean fair play, or that every one may feel free to worship according to the dictates of his conscience. It means, "Let me do as I please!" The people in Spain are crying out for religious liberty, and the Church would gain in the respect and consideration of the people if she would be generous enough to allow there what she is asking for in Mexico and the United States.

But Rome has always been like that. Where she has obtained a grasp she does not allow any one else to enjoy equal rights with her; and where she has no grasp, or has lost it, she appeals to religious liberty in order to conquer.

We know what is the strongest reason for Rome's opposition to religious liberty in Spain. According to the budget of the Spanish Government, it is giving to the Church of Rome, including bishops, priests and converts, 674,435,500 pesetas, yearly, and that, of course, is a great reason for her interest that no one should participate in the fat things she enjoys.

"El Heraldo," a very enlightened paper in Spain, gives us this pertinent remark on the subject: "While such fabulous sums are paid for things that produce nothing, in 1909, 111,058 persons were obliged by hunger to emigrate from Spain, and in the first six months of this year 75,000 have left Spain for the same reason."

ROME'S BID FOR TEMPORAL POWER*

BY ERNEST PHILLIPS.

The question of the temporal, or sovereign, power of the papacy is the most interesting of all the controversial matters connected with the Church of Rome. It has been a most fruitful subject for debate and criticism, equally alike, among the friends and foes of the papacy. It has divided the Church of Rome, and has fostered in that institution such a spirit of worldliness and military aggression that it has well-nigh ceased to minister to the spiritual needs of its members.

The early members of the Church of Rome placed *Scriptural Truth before worldly ambition*, political intrigue and military glory; but when the love of many waxed cold and the simplicity of spiritual worship was replaced by the ritual and the sensual practises of the heathen, then the Church at Rome fell from her position of grace and became the Church of Rome—the woman arrayed in purple and scarlet, gilded with gold, precious stones and pearls, having a cup in her hand full of abominations.

To enlarge on this aspect of the subject is a departure from the topic under discussion, which may be briefly summarized as follows:

- (1) *The Scriptural basis of the claim of the pope to temporal power rests on tradition.*
- (2) *The Historical basis of the claim rests on forgery.*
- (3) *The Realization of the claim rests on military aggression.*
- (4) *The Destruction of the claim rests with God.*

I.

When we say that the Scriptural basis rests on tradition, we imply a contradiction, because if Rome's claim be based on Scripture it cannot be traditional. Our reason for putting the matter in this way is to show how Rome claims certain portions of Scripture to mean that she has this right exclusively, and by thus wresting the Scriptures she can maintain her hold on the ignorant, simple and superstitious people who are baptized into her faith and taught that there is no salvation outside of her fold. There is not a single text in Holy Scripture which leads us to believe that it is the will of God that the Church of Rome, or any other church, should concern herself with the political affairs of

*A paper read at the Autumn Conference of the Kenalt College Associates.

the State; but, on the other hand, there are statements of an opposite character.

When our blessed Redeemer was tempted by the devil, He was shown all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, and these words were uttered: "*All these things will I give Thee if Thou wilt fall down and worship me.*" Our Lord was tempted, and refused the offer of temporal power; but the *pope was tempted, and fell*. The Master once said: "*My Kingdom is not of this world.*" Again, it was Peter who was rebuked for using the sword against his fellow. As our Lord would not settle a dispute between two brothers, it is evident that the pope's claims are not founded upon Holy Scripture; and yet Cardinal Ferrari, in his "Ecclesiastical Dictionary," says: "The pope is the divine monarch and supreme emperor and king of kings, hence the pope is crowned with a triple crown, as king of Heaven and of earth and of the lower regions."

II.

The historical basis of the claim rests on forgery, and for this statement there is proof that certain documents contain interpolations; while, on the other hand, the non-production of the deed of gift which Pepin is said to have given to the pope, and which we are told is preserved in the Vatican, is significant indeed. A claimant to landed estates must produce his title deeds or be non-suited, and afterward prosecuted for fraud. Such a claim cannot be made merely on tradition; it is impossible. Every estate would soon change hands if this were the law of the land.

Going further back than Pepin's time, there was a pope, named Adrian I., who said that the Emperor Constantine, by imperial donation, made over Rome and Italy to the Holy See. No doubt the statement was made to impress Charlemagne and gain from him further concessions of territory. The famous Dr. Dollinger said there was no trace of the donation to be found anywhere; while *Cardinal Baronius*, one of the most distinguished of Church annalists, *declared it a forgery*.

If we allow the argument that Pepin made the donation, then he only granted the Italian territory held by the Lombards, and taken by him from the Lombard king.

How, then, did the popes become possessed of Rome? The Lombards did not possess Rome, and Pepin had no authority

in Rome, for he never conquered the Eternal City. It is clear, therefore, that Pepin did not grant the city to the papacy. To continue, Pope Zachary was succeeded by Stephen III., who proved himself an adept at forgery, in order to consolidate the bargain made by his predecessor with Pepin; for when the king of Lombardy began making war to regain the provinces taken from him by Pepin he (Stephen III.) sent Pepin letters addressed to him by the Apostle Peter, the Virgin Mary, and several angels, saints and martyrs, imploring the said Pepin to defend the papacy against the attacks of Astolphus, king of Lombardy. The Apostle Peter implored Pepin, in his letter, "to save the beloved city of Rome from the detested Lombards." If the present pope could produce this letter of Peter's, he would make more money out of its exhibition than he gains by Peter's pence in one year. The non-production of the letter is sufficient proof of forgery.

It is quite interesting to think of Peter in the abode of bliss troubling himself about the pope's interest in the city of Rome, writing a long letter to Pepin with regard to the temporalities of the papacy. The letter written by the Virgin Mary would be worth a king's ransom, if produced. We have seen the basis of Rome's claim to the States of the Church, as they are now called; but this is not the full extent of the claim of the papacy, because each pope claims universal dominion.

It was Pope Zachary who secured the first donation; Pope Stephen III. secured the second; later popes secured other provinces, including Rome, and then developed the doctrine of universal papal sovereignty. It has well been said "that the temporal power of the popes derived from the donation of Pepin was not legitimately obtained, but was usurped by a flagrant violation of the law of the empire and the law of nations." (*The Papacy and the Civil Power*, by R. W. Thompson, p. 336.)

"And yet it is true, doubtless, that Pepin did put the pope in possession of the conquered territory, and confer upon him, as far as he could, the authority to govern it, as the head of the Roman Church, but without any attempt to convey it by deed." (*Ibid.*, p. 332.)

III.

The realization of the claim rests on military aggression. This brings us to the subject-matter immediately under discus-

sion. Believing that Holy Writ foretold the character of popery, let us reverently turn over its sacred pages and read words which so many students of prophecy connect with this system:

"And in her was found the blood of prophets and of saints and of all that were slain upon the earth" (Rev. 18: 24). Rome's bid for temporal power has from the earliest time of her history involved nations in war. The Day of Judgment alone will reveal the dark, sinister plots planned with so much craft and cunning by popes, priests and members of religious orders dressed in the garb of sanctity, but steeped to their lips in treason against God and man. Again: *"In her was found the blood of all that were slain upon the earth."* It is all a matter of history—the story of fallen empires, broken nations, lost provinces, bereaved homes, wandering fugitives, lonely women and orphan children. Yes, it is all a matter of history—sickness, disease, privation, poverty and death. Yes, all these things for Rome's ambition, to satisfy her lust for power. Lecky once said: *"The Church of Rome has shed more innocent blood than any other institution that has existed among men."*

Our Lord said to Pilate: *"My Kingdom is not of this world. If My Kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews."*

Therefore, if we want to find the vicar of Christ, we must not look for him in a Church that wields the sword, but among Christians who preach peace and good-will.

With regard to the temporal power which the popes coveted so largely and held so tenaciously for centuries, we find that it was waning early in the eighteenth century in Italy until it was confined to the limits of the States of the Church. In 1797 the pope was compelled to cede much territory to France, and in 1798, owing to a revolution in Rome, a republic was declared; but in 1801 the pope succeeded in gaining the good-will of Napoleon and was restored.

In 1813 the pope was compelled to surrender his authority in France, and so the tide ebbed and flowed, until in 1870 the temporal power of the pope was broken in one day, and the king of Italy became monarch in Rome. Facts that are well known must be stated here, because without them this subject would not be complete.

The late Rev. Hugh Price Hughes once had an interview with the late Cardinal Manning, concerning which the late Mr. Hughes states, in the "Methodist Times" for August 6, 1896:

"I was simply horrified at the calmness with which he declared that he would be willing to deluge Europe in blood in order to destroy the unity of Italy and recover the temporal power of the pope."

Professor Nippold, in his learned work, "The Papacy in the Nineteenth Century," thus describes the causes of the war between France and Germany in 1870:

"The ecclesiastico-political plans of the Jesuits had long been prepared, and the pope was more and more dominated by the order. The 18th and 19th of July, 1870, witnessed the realization of these plans. The proclamation of the new dogma (of papal infallibility) was to coincide with the victory of Roman Catholic France, in order to establish the papacy in the full possession of its new autocracy. . . . The Jesuit keepers of the Empress' (Eugenie) conscience received their direction from the same Jesuit College at Rome in which the addresses in favor of the new dogma had been set up and the further acts of the council comedy had been prepared. As soon as the last difficulties which had stood in the way of the proclamation of papal absolutism had been set aside, Benedetti, the French ambassador, received the order for the insulting demand upon the king of Prussia which he made at Ems." (Pp. 16-24.)

Let us bear in mind the fact that the pope claimed the right of being represented at The Hague Conference as a temporal sovereign—a claim that was rejected by the Great Powers. The following incident happened after the Conference:

"The President of the American Delegation, Dr. Andrew Dixon White, at one time U. S. A. Ambassador at the court of Berlin, was about to depart when he found at the doors a leading Roman Catholic diplomat. He was in an impetuous temper. What had aroused him was a letter from the pope, which had been read at the Conference, containing the usual *monstrous claims representing the pope as the world's peacemaker*. He said: 'The Vatican has always been, and is to-day, a storm-centre. The pope and his advisers have never hesitated to urge on war, no matter how bloody, when the slightest of their ordinary worldly pur-

poses could be served by it. The great religious wars of Europe were entirely stirred up and egged on by them, and, as everybody knows, the pope did everything to prevent the signing of the Treaty of Munster, which put an end to the dreadful Thirty Years' War, even going so far as to declare the oaths taken by the plenipotentiaries at that Congress of no effect. All through the Middle Ages and at the Renaissance period, the popes kept Italy in turmoil and bloodshed for their own family and territorial advantages, and they kept all Europe in turmoil for two centuries after the Reformation—in fact, just as long as they could—in the wars of religion. They did everything they could to stir up the war between Austria and Prussia in 1866, thinking that Austria, a Catholic power, was sure to win; and then everything possible to stir up the war of France against Prussia in 1870, in order to accomplish the same purpose of checking German Protestantism; and now they are doing all they can to arouse hatred, even to deluge Italy in blood, in the vain attempt to recover the temporal power. . . . Their whole policy is based on stirring up hatred and promoting conflicts from which they hope to draw worldly advantage. In view of all this, one stands amazed at the cool statements of the Vatican letter.' " (*Autobiography of Dr. White*. Vol. II., pp. 349-351.)

A leading Roman Catholic paper, the "Western Watchman," published weekly in the U. S. A., and edited by Father Phelan, said recently:

"The late Cardinal Rampolla always said that a general European war would undoubtedly restore Rome to the pope. If Italy does not get into this war while it is on she will have to get out of Rome when it is over."—(September 3, 1914.)

"From a European war, it has been said, Cardinal Rampolla expected the settlement of the Roman question. In the struggle against Napoleon in 1815 the Roman pontiff got back his liberty and his temporal possessions. Why not, then, whenever nations fall foul of each other, and thus help honest men to come into their own?"—(August 27, 1914.)

"France has rescinded her decrees of banishment directed against the religious orders, and restored the chaplains to their fleet. Next the law of separation will be repealed, and the French embassy at the Vatican will be restored. All to culminate in the

restoration of Rome to the popes." — September 10, 1914.

Rome, in her bid for temporal power in modern times, has centred her hopes upon Germany. This once Lutheran but now rationalistic and Romanist country is fighting in a war which, if successful, will place the pope in the saddle again; because the defeat of the Allies would mean the defeat of Italy, and Italy, if defeated, would be compelled by Germany to surrender the States of the Church. If the Germanic powers are defeated, Italy must be punished later on by her former allies (Germany and Austria) for not supporting them. A sudden invasion of Italy by the Germanic powers would speedily bring about her defeat, and then Italy would have to yield up the States of the Church. We therefore see that, whichever way the war ends, the pope expects to recover his temporal power. There is, on the one hand, Germany, with her ambitious schemes for world-power . . . and, on the other hand, the papacy, with her ambition for temporal power and world-wide supremacy, instigating the war. The Central Party in the German Parliament is entirely Roman Catholic, and would only agree to vote the supplies necessary for Germany's military and naval aggrandizement on condition that the Kaiser allowed the Jesuits to return to Germany, and for other special favors to Roman Catholics. The Kaiser was obliged to agree to the terms in order to get the enormous military and naval forces necessary . . . thus the pope gained the prospect of his ambition by supporting the military schemes of the Kaiser and the war.

Roman Catholic Belgium had to be sacrificed—something must go if need be. It was no doubt regrettable from Rome's standpoint; but, oh, the gain of temporal power! Was that not far more important than Belgium? England, France, Russia and Servia were being punished; therefore, Belgium must be sacrificed in order that four heretical powers might suffer for their crime in not supporting the pope's claim to temporal power.

IV.

The destruction of the claim rests with God. This thought takes our minds backward, for was not Satan cast out because he claimed the prerogatives of God? Is it wrong to assume that Satan entered into the Church of Rome and filled her bishop with ideas of world-wide supremacy in order that he might

delay the advancement of Christ's Kingdom upon earth? He who says he represents Christ upon earth may only represent the powers of darkness. Let Holy Scripture say the last word:

"And a mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus, with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all (Rev. 18: 21).

"And after these things I heard a great voice of much people in Heaven, saying, Alleluia! Salvation, and glory and honor and power unto the Lord our God (Rev. 19: 1). And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia! for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth" (Rev. 19: 6).

We are always glad to give a place in our magazine to our friend, Mr. Phillips.

We fully agree with him that Rome has fixed her hopes of temporal power on Germany. We must add that it was a secret plan of Rome several years ago, when the morganatic marriage of the Crown Prince of Austria took place, to cause a great civil revolution in Austria over the succession to the throne, in which the German Emperor was going to take the opportunity of annexing Austria to his dominions. But this plan was somewhat shaken, though not entirely destroyed, by Merry del Val, who, as our readers know, tried to cultivate the friendship of the Crown Prince. His political activities were encouraged by Merry del Val in order to give him popularity, thus lessening the hope that Germany would be called to play any part in the succession. Merry's demand for vengeance on the assassination of the Archduke, as we have already pointed out, makes him morally responsible for the outbreak of the war.

We have to allow that Mr. Phillip's article shows a great deal of patriotic feeling, but we do not entirely agree with him as to the "ambitious schemes for world-power" attributed to the Emperor of Germany.

Ever since I was a child in Spain, both in school and in the convent, I was always taught to look upon England as ambitious and treacherous. We do not believe that either of the powers was willing to bring about this war, and even if any one of them should dare to do so with the mere spirit of conquest, it would not have been possible to find a people willing to fill the army.

We must bear in mind that the call which aroused the fighting nations in a mass has been to defend the integrity of their country, and not to conquer fresh territory.

Now, here is a point that needs some explanation. While nearly all the nations were ready to disarm, Germany refused. That is perfectly clear to me. Germany, through Jesuitical influence, has regarded France and England with great mistrust, and was made to understand that the question of disarmament was a mere plot of England to subdue Germany; besides that, Germany was sure of a war of extension in Austria, and expected there to find international complications, for which she must be ready. No one ever thought that this great conflict would come about through Servia.

THE EDITOR.

LETTER TO CARDINAL GIBBONS

XLIII.

Dear Cardinal:

In speaking of the insincere and underhand methods employed by your Church there is one point I should especially like to make clear. That is, that your Church has adopted in this country the policy of denial. If any patriot or champion of truth is bold enough to accuse her, she is always ready with a negation of the charge and an assumption of righteous indignation. As an example of this, the statement is repeatedly made in your papers that the Church is not concerned in political matters, but only in the spiritual welfare of the people. Of course, some men who esteem themselves to be "wise," and yet are blissfully ignorant of things they ought to know, have been completely taken in by these assertions, and any warning against the insincerity of your ecclesiastical organization is looked upon as bigotry. From the attitude they assume, one might deduce that they believe we have become but little better than pagans and have real need that the Roman Church should teach us what true religious devotion means!

As you also know, Cardinal, it has become quite a common thing among Catholics to make offers of five or ten thousand dollars to any one who is able to prove such and such an accusation against the Church to be true. I am ready to follow their good example and make you an offer, but, being a poor man, my offer shall not consist of a sum of money, even though I am positive I should never be required to pay it. No, I shall offer something better. It is the promise that I will never write anything detrimental to your Church, if the pope, with the approval of a council, will renounce the following doctrines:

1st. "That the State must be reunited with the Church and be required to obey her spiritual commands in the enactment of laws.

2d. "That the Roman Catholic religion shall be established by law as the only true religion, and every other form of religious belief shall be treated as heresy and punished accordingly.

3d. "That restrictions must be placed upon the liberty of speech and of the press.

4th. "That the Roman Catholic Church shall be recognized as an organization exempt from obedience to all laws relating to the ownership and management of real property.

5th. "That the clergy of the Church shall also be exempt from obedience to the laws, and shall be bound only by such as the pope shall prescribe.

6th. "That our common school system must be absolutely and entirely abolished."

If the Church renounces the above, I promise to use my pen and all my energy toward inducing our Government to sign a *concordat* with Rome to this effect, and to treat as a bigot any one who dares to accuse your Church of political aims.

Do you think you could persuade the pope to sign such a *concordat*?

But while your Church is so overzealous for these principles (whatever her asseverations to the contrary may be) that she would rather retain in her fold a priest who denies, *in his heart*, the existence of purgatory, the efficacy of the mass, or even the divinity of Christ, than one who denies any of the above doctrines, are we not justified in warning the people against her political aims? Do not these doctrines deal a deadly blow to our form of Government?

I know that there are many, probably hundreds of Catholics in America who would turn against the Church if she should come out boldly and declare her pretensions, but that only proves the fairness of our position in condemning your Church for her policy of keeping even her own people ignorant as to her real purpose. The Roman Church has never yet conquered a country but through deception. Her history in the United States is a repetition of the history of her policy everywhere, since the Jesuits took upon themselves the shaping of her destinies.

To some it may seem impossible that she should foster such doctrines as those I have enumerated in this country, being, as they are, entirely opposed to our constitution and Government. But those who still cherish patriotic sentiments and who have an unshaken faith in our democratic institutions should bear in mind that the Church has always made use of two weapons for the conquest of a country—the favor of politicians and the edu-

cation of the young. By means of the first she presses into her service those who are ambitious of place and power; with the second she seeks to destroy any remnant of national tradition and true patriotism.

That she already wields the first of these weapons, here in the United States, we know only too well. The Catholic vote has great influence over the minds of our *patriotic* candidates—even those who aspire to the presidency; and the fact that over seventy-five per cent. of Government positions are occupied by Roman Catholics is in itself more than sufficient to *appease religious differences*.

As to our public schools, they are assailed openly by the Catholics everywhere. If the Jesuits had declared some years ago that their purpose was to destroy our school system, they probably could never have succeeded in establishing a parochial school in the country. Good-natured tolerance, believing itself to be founded on our principles of liberty and equality, but in reality bred by ignorance and fed by deceit, has allowed them to grow, and to-day they uncover their purpose. And they would not do so unless they could count on strength enough to support their claims.

How have they succeeded in obtaining such power and influence? First, by craftily compassing the removal of the Bible from the public schools, and then turning around with an appeal to pious parents, both Protestant and Catholic, painting in vivid colors the consequences of depriving the youth of the land of all religious instruction in the school, and the necessity of impressing the young heart with spiritual things. "In my youth I applied my heart unto '*religion*,'" is the way they quote the Scriptures! Their schools, being established with no other object in view, according to them, than to supply this lack of religious instruction, were calculated to appeal to both religious and patriotic sentiments and bring them the patronage, not only of Catholics, but also of those deluded Protestants who thought they preferred Catholic teaching to the *no religion* of the public schools, which should only be supported by atheists.

To make their schools more acceptable to Protestant parents, the Jesuits did not hesitate to send the young nuns and priests they were going to employ as teachers to the public schools to

learn what they could not learn in the convent, and so raise the grade of their instruction to a point above adverse criticism.

They sought also, and have succeeded in many cases, to get hold of the direction of the public schools through Roman Catholic principals and teachers. It is of course forbidden by the law of the land to teach any form of religion, but the law cannot prevent teachers from occasionally expressing before their pupils their dissatisfaction because the Government of this free land does not allow them liberty to teach what they might if they were employed in such and such Catholic school, where the sisters can teach what they please, and where the pupils, both Catholic and Protestant, are so happy and so brilliant and accomplished. If it happens that any one of their number should be sent to a convent school, the excellence of her parents' choice would be emphasized by these teachers, and knowing well the influence of pride and rivalry over the young, they act as the best of agents for attracting pupils to the Catholic schools.

One of the greatest obstacles the Jesuits found in their path was the tendency to liberality among the priests in this country. In the case of a young priest brought over from Europe, the atmosphere of democracy often proved too strong for him to resist; and on the other hand it was equally difficult to banish from the mind of a youth born in this country his early education in democratic ideas, so opposed to the very essence of Romanism. How were they to solve the problem?

In spite of claiming to have established in America the best centres of education in the world, they founded an American college and seminary in Rome, where they send the most brilliant and promising of their theological students, where the most extreme principles of autocracy are taught, where the ambition for distinction and rank is inculcated, and whence the young priest is not allowed to return to America until they can graduate him completely un-Americanized and completely Romanized, with so strong an ambition for promotion to a bishopric within him that he can be depended on, though born an American, to act as the worst enemy to the basic principles of his native land. Only graduates of this school can expect to rise to any high place in the Church in America.

All this shows only too plainly that the real purpose of your

Church has been hidden from the people. The Jesuitical principle applied to this country is: "Make the people less Protestant and less American, and you will win." I cannot conceive of any American taking sides with the Roman Church except through ignorance, or indifference to national principles. How can any one who knows history believe that the Roman Church is not a political machine, or that all her efforts are not directed toward political power and dominion? The mere fact that the pope, in spite of the generous Law of Guaranties, remains a prisoner of the Vatican, should be enough to show them that, no matter what you say to the contrary, he is claiming temporal power.

If the Church were what you try to persuade us she is in this country, why is the veracity of your claims not proved by Spain, France, or South America? Instead of rebelling against her and resisting her tyranny, they would be contented with their lot and loyal to Mother Church, if she had indeed undergone such a reform as you would have Americans believe. No, it is with a cloak of sheepskin that the Church is covering the ravenous jaws and heart of a wolf, and those who believe in her, no matter what position they occupy in the political or scientific world, are either dishonest or ignorant.

I understand that it is difficult for an honest mind to believe in the existence of dishonesty, particularly in religious matters. But, treating of the Roman Church, her history proves that religion, for her, has ever been merely a cloak, and this has been peculiarly true since the Jesuits came into existence. Can you tell me of any country where they have not entered falsely feigning disinterested friendship, and have not had to be banished as traitors?

Melchior Cano, a Dominican and professor of theology in the University of Salamanca, who was celebrated for his wisdom and piety, and who banished the Jesuits from that city, used to say: "The Antichrist must be at hand, because his precursors and emissaries, the Jesuits, are beginning to appear and abound." His penetrating mind comprehended the spirit of the Jesuits so well that in 1560, while bishop of the Canary Islands, he wrote to the Emperor Charles V., whose confessor he had formerly been: "If the members of the society continue as they have

begun, God grant there may not come a time when kings will wish to resist and will find no means of doing so."

But the best portrait of the Jesuits is that drawn by an archbishop of Dublin, which has proven to be a true prophecy. On the first Sunday after Easter, 1551, he preached a sermon in which he said in part: "There are a new Fraternity of late sprung up, who call themselves Jesuits, which will deceive many, who are much after the Scribes' and Pharisees' manner among the Jews. They shall strive to abolish the Truth, and shall come very near to do it; for these sorts will turn themselves into several forms. With the heathen, a heathenist; with atheists, an atheist; with the Jews, a Jew; and with the reformers, a reformed; purposely to know your intentions, your minds, your hearts and your inclinations, and thereby bringing you at last to be like the fool that *said in his heart there was no God*. These shall be spread over the whole world, shall be admitted into the councils of princes, and they never the wiser; charming of them, yea, making your princes reveal their hearts and the secrets therein unto them, and yet they not perceive it." . . .

Arias Montanus, one of the greatest Hebrew scholars and theologians of his time, wrote of the Jesuits in 1571 to Philip II.: "There are few persons in all Spain who know by more convincing proofs than myself their designs and pretensions, and with how great address and by what means they labor to arrive at their end. I have no doubt that they move Heaven and earth to carry out their designs. I am not ignorant that they have everywhere spies to inform them of all that passes, both in regard to themselves and others."

Some may object that these quotations belong to a century so long past, that we ought to expect the character of the Jesuits to have improved under the influence of "modern progress." I grant, dear reader, that they may have "improved," but only in the sense of becoming more expert in cunning and subterfuge, more accurate of aim and sure of hitting their mark unfailingly at every skilful blow, and, above all, wearing a more impenetrable cloak than ever of hypocrisy to deceive the world. Where the root is bitter, can the fruit be sweet? "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?"

MANUEL FERRANDO.

PASTORAL LETTER OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF CARACAS AND VENEZUELA, S. A.

We, Doctor Juan Bta. Castro, by the grace of God and of the Holy Apostolic See, Archbishop of Caracas and Venezuela, Assistant Prelate of the Sacred Pontifical Throne—To our most venerable Dean and Metropolitan Chapter, clergy and faithful of the Archdiocese: Greeting, in our Lord Jesus Christ.

A strong recrudescence of Protestantism has been noted in these latter days; everywhere circulate leaflets, pamphlets, periodicals in support of the Babel of errors sustained by Protestantism, and they have gone so far as to vomit their poison against the immaculate Virgin Mary! Thanks be to God, we are conscious of not having failed to do our duty in combating Protestantism, as far as has been possible, by preaching, by repeated excitations of our clergy, by periodicals, leaflets, pamphlets, and even by catechisms written expressly against this very Protestantism; we have failed to do only that which was not possible to be done, and even to-day, in the archdiocese, efforts are continued to combat this pest which invades us and to wrestle with it untiringly.

But religious ignorance is very great, as is also the number of the poor, and this is taken advantage of by Protestantism in order to secure adherents; we therefore resolve to give to-day a fundamental instruction which shall leave room for no discussion whatever, for we are going to combat Protestantism with its own weapons. Protestantism tells us that it believes in nothing but the Bible; with the Bible, then, we shall reduce it to powder. We shall show it that the Church, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman, as it exists to-day in its organization and in its life, has its foundation, clear and explicit, in the Gospel; in that Gospel of Jesus Christ, which it also has in its hands and which it considers to be the only revealed truth. Let us divide this pastoral letter, then, into three parts: The Pope, the Church, and the Bible.

The Pope

Jesus Christ speaks, making Peter the foundation of His Church, and says to him: *"Thou art Peter, and upon this stone I shall build My Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. I will give thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven;*

whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven." Thus we read in the Gospel of St. Matthew, chap. 16, vs. 17, 18 and 19, and thus the Protestants must have read millions of times, but without taking in what is stated in this great text.

Behold here, then, Jesus Christ, who takes Peter to be the chief of His Church, neither more nor less, as God took Abraham that he might become the father of the faithful. He does not treat, as may be seen, of a position of honor, nor of a simple faculty to preside or direct, but He makes of the apostle the foundation-stone of His Church; the Church is to be built upon him and to be fully sustained by him, with the authority to govern her, increase her and defend her, without limitation.

Jesus Christ declares that the gates of Hell shall not prevail against *this stone*, for in the Vatican council, in an admirable discourse, it was demonstrated by the original text that the pronoun *it* does not refer to the Church, but to the stone. This discourse decided in the council the definition of the infallibility of the pope.

Jesus Christ, besides, gives to St. Peter the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. It is well known that, in those times, to give up the keys of a city, and even to-day, to give the keys of a house, is to give the city or the house into the charge of him who receives them. St. Peter, therefore, receives an absolute and perfect dominion over the Kingdom of God, as much in Heaven as upon earth, as though it were his own property; therefore whatsoever he does here upon earth shall be confirmed in Heaven, and whatsoever he shall loose upon earth shall be loosed in Heaven.

It is amazing; it seems that the very power of God cannot raise a mortal higher; St. Peter receives the same authority over the Church that Jesus Christ had over her in His holy humanity. Therefore the pope calls himself with all propriety THE VICAR OF JESUS CHRIST. Woe to him who stumbles against this stone, for he shall be broken to pieces! Woe to him upon whom this stone shall fall, for it shall reduce him to atoms!

But Jesus Christ wished to make more explicit the authority He gave to St. Peter, so that no subterfuge might be made use

of against it; therefore He said to him, and to him alone: "*Feed My sheep; feed My lambs.*" We read this in the Gospel of St. John, chap. 21, vs. 15 and 17. Attention must be called to the fact that in the command of Jesus Christ the whole of the Church is included, for a flock is composed, in its entirety, of sheep and lambs.

As to the verb "pasture" (feed), it comprehends and expresses all that a shepherd does for his sheep—to nourish, watch over, defend, direct and take care of them in every way.

Such a change may well be seen to be incompatible with human weakness, and, above all, with the facility with which man may fall into error; it would have been impossible without the divine assistance, and Jesus Christ provided for this by saying on another occasion to Peter: "*Simon, Simon, Satan has desired to have all of you that he may sift you as wheat, but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and thou . . . confirm thy brethren therein.*" Thus we read in the Gospel of St. Luke, chap. 22, vs. 31 and 32.

Note the distinction the Lord makes concerning Peter, saying: All of you shall be tempted; but *thy* faith shall never fail, because I have prayed for *thee* that thou mayest preserve it intact and confirm therein all My Church. It is the dogma of pontifical infallibility.

And now, O Protestants! what have you to say against this magnificent foundation of the papacy, made by Jesus Christ without the possibility of misinterpreting even one of His words? We know already that you say all these prerogatives were for St. Peter and that they died with him. But St. Peter was hardly able to exercise them, occupied as he was in the foundation of the churches and enduring persecutions; the apostles, on the other hand, being free for the propagation of the Gospel and the establishment and government of the same churches.

It is as much as to say that with the death of St. Peter the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were lost, the flock was left without a pastor, there was no longer any one to teach the truth with infallible certainty, nor to pardon the sinner, because he who had power to bind and loose was missing. Certainly all this horror of ruin and deficiencies and suppressions is Protestantism, but, thanks be to God, this is not the Gospel! Protestants, if

you are logical, place yourselves under the authority of the pope, who has been your stone of offense; listen to him and follow him, and you will be saved.

The Church

Having established the stone, made the foundation, designated the head of the Church, Jesus Christ institutes the same in a manner complete and perfect: He divides it into two parts, well defined and determined—the part which should teach and govern and the part which must hear and obey. Jesus Christ forms the first part by instituting a hierarchy of bishops, presbyters and inferior ministers. All this hierarchy is to remain intimately united to the pope, so that he may fulfil his mission with profit and security.

Does all this exist in the New Testament? Was the Church founded with this hierarchy? Does it exist to-day with this same hierarchy, without any variation?

It is clear that in the Gospel cannot yet be observed the first movements of the Church, which did not begin till after the coming of the Holy Spirit, but they may be clearly seen in the *Acts of the Apostles*, which the Protestants have allowed to remain in the Bibles they distribute. All this sacred book is nothing but a history of the way in which the apostles founded the first church, and there this hierarchy clearly appears with the divine right which can never fail.

We shall not speak of bishops, for the Protestants in general admit them. As to presbyters and ministers, it is enough to quote the words of St. Paul to Timothy: "*The presbyters who preside, as is right, are worthy of double honor.*" So we are taught by the first epistle of Timothy, chap. 5, v. 17. St. Paul orders Titus also to *establish priests in the cities* (Epistle, chap. 1, v. 5), just as before he had prescribed the institution of deacons. This we are taught in the *Acts of the Apostles*, chap. 4. The Protestants may see if this is fulfilled to-day in the Church as religiously and punctually as it was fulfilled by the apostles.

But the Church had to be composed of individuals, subject, as we have said of the pope, to errors and deviations. This is an essential part of human imperfection and weakness. Therefore this body of the Church, this society, divine and supernatural,

needed to have a divine element and assistance to maintain it in the straight path of its destiny; otherwise it was impossible for it to continue in the way that Jesus Christ had traced for it. What human institution has maintained itself always the same from the time of its origin? None. All are born, flourish, are divided, transformed, decay and die. The best example of this is Protestantism, which to-day not even Luther himself would recognize.

This has not happened to the Church at any moment of her existence, because the divine element is with her, sustaining her, strengthening her and directing her. *"I am with you alway, even unto the consummation of the ages,"* said Jesus Christ to His apostles when He sent them to teach all peoples. So we read in the Gospel of St. Matthew, chap. 28, v. 20, and He promises them besides that the Spirit of Truth will come to accompany them, that is, the Holy Spirit, that He may remain with them forever and teach them all truth, as we are told by the evangelist St. John in chapters 14 and 16.

Only so is it possible to understand that the Church has remained immutable, indefectible, infallible through twenty centuries of struggles, persecutions and exterminations, accumulated by Hell against her. Look for a human institution which can offer a like example!

But if this Church, assisted by the Spirit of Truth and accompanied always by Jesus Christ, has fallen into a state of decadence, as Protestantism declares—has become corrupt, degenerate, what she says no longer being the truth, nor what she teaches making for morality—it is clear that the work of Jesus Christ has been a failure, that His promises have ended in emptiness, that He had not sufficient power to confirm in the world the true religion, and that it was necessary for Martin Luther to come (horror!!) to restore His work and set in order those things which had become disordered! But who is capable of admitting such a monstrosity?

No! the Church of Jesus Christ is intact; she has not deteriorated at any time, she has not failed even in one iota. The Gospel answers for her, and her doors are open, O Protestants, for you to return to her bosom.

The Bible

The Bible and nothing but the Bible—such is the password or countersign of Protestantism; to know the divine revelation and be saved, one has only to read the Bible—and understand it, of course.

But this presents very serious difficulties. The first difficulty, and it is not a small one, in the field of Protestantism, is to know if there really exists a Bible. Archimedes, who asked for nothing but a lever and a place to rest it on in order to lift the world, ended by leaving the world in its place, because he failed to find the lever or the place to support it. So also the Lutheran or Calvinist apprentice, who needs nothing but a Bible to establish himself in religion, will be left without it, because he will never be able to say with conviction: "I have the true Bible, at last!"

And, supposing he has found the authentic Bible, how is he to know that this Bible is truly inspired of God? Nothing remains for him but the absurd and brutish solution of Protestantism; that is to say: All men are liars on the subject of religion; I can trust no one but myself!

But the Protestant will say: The authenticity of the Bible is proved by the tradition of all Christian generations. But, we say, if this tradition is infallible, it is the Catholic tradition, and if it is not infallible, how can Protestantism affirm it? What security can we have in it? But, besides, the Bible of to-day has passed through many translations, and how is the Protestant to assure himself that these translations are faithful? There is nothing for him to do, in order to remove all doubt, but to read the Bible in the original Greek and Hebrew texts.

No, Protestantism will answer, there are translations the fidelity of which is universally recognized, and we may well trust public opinion on this point and especially the opinion of the learned.

Ah, then you give to public opinion and the opinion of the learned, O Protestants, the infallibility you deny to the Catholic Church, and are disposed to trust yourselves to a translator rather than to the authority of this holy Church!

Nonsense! In order to stop the mouth of a partidarian of the Bible-religion, it suffices to put to him this question: You quote

the Bible endlessly, but how do you know surely that there is a Bible?

O Protestants, how is it that you deny things which are recognized by every one and which form the foundation of order and of human knowledge?

The Bible is a law, and therefore needs a judge to explain and interpret it with competent authority.

The Bible is a divine revelation, and it needs a religious authority to show us at the proper occasion and moment its meaning.

The Bible is a history, and some one is needed who can tell us with all assurance that this history is not a legend.

Only the Catholic Church offers sufficient titles to prove that she is the judge, the interpreter and the teacher who guarantees the truth of the Bible in every respect.

Without this authority things are but floating in the air, and we cannot know even if there exists a Bible!

On the other hand, who is there who does not know that all books which have been some time in existence and over which have passed new customs, new ideas and even new forms of speech, need, with imperative necessity, an interpretation? How can the Latin and Greek classics be understood without the notes of the learned? How can the Letters of St. Theresa be understood in their totality, though they are only 300 years old, without the explanations and commentaries which have been added to them? And how, therefore, is it possible to pretend that a book like the Bible, written in languages already dead, and in epochs having ideas and customs which have already disappeared, can be read and comprehended without any interpretation? One stands amazed to see to what lengths can go the absurdities and insanity of man!

Beloved children! remain ever more firmly established in the bosom of the holy Catholic Church, to which you have the happiness of belonging; take careful precautions against all seductions and deceit, for the times are evil and the serpent has many resources.

Here are the laws imposed upon you by the authority of the Church, and which you must observe under pain of mortal sin, and in some cases of excommunication:

You must not co-operate in any respect, either positively or negatively, with the Protestant propaganda; therefore you must not rent houses for the worship of this false religion, nor send your children to its schools, however great may be their prestige or intellectual resources; nor may you teach classes in these schools, though you may pretend to excuse yourselves because of much need, for this is one of their ways of accrediting themselves among Catholic families.

You may not aid in any way the propaganda of periodicals, leaflets, books and Protestant Bibles, because the burden of all the sins which through your agency may be committed will rest upon you.

Avoid religious discussions with Protestants, because in them there may be grave injury to your faith.

And let those who have contracted mixed marriages take care to keep religiously the vows they made before marriage, for life is very short, and no man can make a mock of God.

May God our Lord bless you that this pastoral may produce the fruit we desire for the good of your souls!

These our letters shall be read in the Holy Metropolitan Church, and in the parishes and affiliated churches of the city, on the following Sunday, the 25th instant, and in the outlying parishes on the first festival day after their receipt, and they shall be affixed to the chancels.

Given, signed, sealed and authorized in our archepiscopal palace of Caracas, the 21st of July, 1915.

JUAN BAUTISTA,

Archbishop of Caracas.

The foregoing pastoral, translated from the Spanish, as it appeared last Summer in "*La Religion*," the organ of the Roman Church in Caracas, is a good example of the best arguments in her own favor Rome has to offer. The able reply of Dr. Marcelo Maldonado, an ex-priest of the same city, will appear in our next issue, together with the story of the swift vengeance wreaked upon him by the Church for his presumption in contradicting "the Lord's anointed."

This story must open the eyes of many to the great need of helping and protecting in so far as we are able those who have the courage to break the fetters that bind them, and come out boldly in the cause of Truth and Freedom.

EDITOR.

AWAY FROM ROME

It seems that on the Continent the Roman Church is dinning it into the ears of every one who will listen that it is making marvellous progress in England, and that it is only a question of a little time when that stronghold of the Reformation will be won back to its ancient allegiance.

Those who wish to see this contention disproved completely are referred to McCabe's *The Decay of the Church of Rome*. The position it takes is that "Apart from France, the Roman Catholic Church has *lost more heavily in the English-speaking world than it has done in the Latin world.*" Rome has lost more heavily in Great Britain than in any other country except France; and in no other case is it so easy to establish and determine its loss with entire certainty."

This statement is very different from that of those who speak of the marvellous progress of Rome in England. Let us see how he proves it. "The estimates of the Catholic population of Great Britain at the beginning of the nineteenth century vary between 50,000 and 100,000, and the Catholic writer accepts one or other version according to the task he has in hand." "An official return that was made to the House of Lords in 1780 put the number at 69,376, and that figure may be taken as a universal expression of their strength. It was not yet safe for many to avow their belief openly. The French Revolution brought a considerable immigration of Roman Catholics from France. Abbot Gasquet says that 8,000 French priests fled to England in 1792, and that collections were made for them in every (Protestant) parish church in the country. In the beginning of the nineteenth century there must have been over 100,000 Roman Catholics in England.

"By 1814, Gasquet says there were 49,800 Catholics in London alone. An official Roman document puts the number at 200,000 in 1826, but this seems to be optimistic. If we accepted all the figures quoted so lightly by Abbot Gasquet it would be singularly disastrous for his cause. He says, for instance, that Bishop Griffiths estimated the Catholic population of London in 1829 at 146,000 (in a population of 1,500,000). As we shall see they do not reach that figure to-day (in a population of 6,000,000, and after eight years of strenuous proselytism) the

inference would be appalling. . . . Then there set in the famous movement of the Anglican Church to the Roman that gave rise to all the inflated hopes of the following decades. The conversion of Newman gave the Church the finest advertisement it has ever had in England. Catholics were dazed with their sudden fortune. . . . What the total gain of the Church was it is impossible to determine. . . . Mr. Gordon Gorman has laboriously compiled a directory of converts. He describes them, somewhat airily, as numbering nearly 10,000 per annum; but though he ranges over the records of sixty years, he gives the names of only about 4,000.

"The moment we take account of the Irish immigration the situation of the Roman Catholic Church in England entirely changes. . . . The terrible famine of 1847 scattered its home-loving people over the English-speaking world. More than 2,000,000 emigrated in three years. And millions have since followed in the familiar paths. In those days of sluggish sailing ships and extreme poverty a very large proportion of the emigrants could do no more than reach Liverpool and spread slowly over the north of England, where tens of thousands of their countrymen already lived. It appears from official statistics that only 780,000 Irish entered the United States between 1840 and 1850, so a very large proportion of the emigrants must have come to Britain; many, no doubt, to leave for America when they had earned a little money. At once Catholicism received an immense accession of members in the north, and many of the more enterprising and less distressed emigrants pushed on to London. At the census of 1881 it was found that there were then living in England 781,119 persons who had been born in Ireland, and as most of these had come over more than thirty years before, a fresh generation of Irish-born Catholics, very frequently the outcome of mixed marriages, had appeared. The net increase must be put at 90 per cent. at least; in other words, there were at least 1,500,000 Irish emigrants and their descendants living in England. This point the Catholic historian usually overlooks."

Abbot Gasquet assigns 146,000 Catholics to London in 1829. They are now 120,000.

KNOCKMA.